

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed June 30, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, amendments have been made in the claims, and each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-12, 18-29, 35-46 and 52-69 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-5, 18, 20-22, 35, 37-39 and 52-54 are amended herein. Claims 2, 19, 36, 55, 58, 60, 63, 65 and 68 are canceled. Claims 70-75 are added. As a result, claims 1, 3-12, 18, 20-29, 35, 37-46, 52-54, 56-57, 59, 61-62, 64, 66-67, and 69-75 are pending for examination, with claims 1, 18, 35, 52, 53 and 54 being independent. No new matter has been added.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3-12, 18, 20-29, 35, 37-46 and 52-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff, et al. ("Burakoff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,239 to Shklar, et al. ("Shklar"). Without acceding to the propriety of the rejection, each of independent claims 1, 18, 35, 52, 53 and 54 is amended herein to more clearly distinguish over any combination of the asserted references.

#### **A. Brief Overview of Embodiments of the Invention**

Embodiments of the invention relate generally to providing access to data, and more particularly to providing a reference to a data element in a source data structure or file (see Applicant's specification at, e.g., p. 1, lines 12-14). By way of background, Applicant's specification explains that securities exchanges and regulatory agencies require that issuers of securities (e.g., mutual funds) make certain information on a security available to potential investors before the security can be sold (p. 1, lines 17-18). Recently, securities issuers have been allowed to make this information available to investors electronically (p. 1, lines 21-22). One facility used to make information available in electronic form is the Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and

Retrieval (EDGAR) system maintained by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) (p. 1, lines 23-25). The EDGAR system stores various documents filed by securities issuers, and is publicly accessible to users via the Internet (p. 1, lines 25-27).

One drawback with the EDGAR system is that documents filed by securities issuers are not stored in a way that allows the "layman" investor to be able to quickly locate all of the information filed for a particular security (p. 1, lines 31-32). For example, there may be numerous filings relating to any one security, as well as amendments, supplements, corrections, etc. to each (p. 2, lines 2-4). In addition, each filing may include information on more than one security (p. 2, lines 2-4). As a result, an investor looking for all of the information on a particular security must generally review, parse, reconcile and organize numerous filings (p. 2, lines 6-7).

The present application incorporates by reference commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 6,122,635 to Burakoff et al., which is cited by the Office Action in rejecting the claims (p.2, lines 9-12). Burakoff describes a system which resolves many of the issues outlined above. Specifically, the system of Burakoff electronically compiles and reconciles securities filings so as to provide a complete, concise, user-friendly and accessible set of information for investors (Abstract).

Applicant has recognized that while the system of Burakoff provides a valuable and useful function in organizing securities information into a user-friendly and accessible form, some users may wish to have the ability to "back-track" from that organized form to the form in which the information was originally filed (e.g., on EDGAR). For example, users may wish to verify that a particular data element is accurate as presented, or view more detail relating to the data element (p. 2, lines 18-22). For example, a user viewing a compiled and reconciled version of information relating to fees charged by a particular mutual fund (e.g., generated by the system of Burakoff) may wish to back-track to the raw filing loaded to EDGAR by the issuer of the fund in which the fee structure was explained, such as to determine whether a particular discount applies to the user (p. 2, lines 22-25).

Embodiments of the present invention provide this capability. For example, some embodiments provide a method which includes identifying, through the execution of programmed instructions, a source location, such as a portion of a file (e.g., a securities filing) in which a data

element is stored (p. 2, lines 15-18). After the source location is identified, an indication of the source location may be stored, and later used to retrieve the data element (p. 5, lines 18-19). For example, a user or programmed procedure may issue a request to access the data element at the source location, and the indication of the source location may be employed to retrieve it (p. 2, lines 22-25).

The foregoing summary is provided to assist the Examiner in appreciating some aspects of the invention. However, this summary does not necessarily apply to each independent claim, and the language of each independent claim may differ in material respects from the examples described above. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner give careful consideration to the language of each independent claim and to address each on its own merits, without relying on the summary above. In this respect, Applicant does not rely upon the foregoing to distinguish any claim over the prior art, but rather relies only upon the remarks below.

B. Brief Overview of Cited References

1. Burakoff

As noted above, Burakoff, which is commonly assigned with the present application, discloses a system for processing securities information stored in one or more repositories, and compiling and organizing the information relating to particular securities (col. 1, line 64 – col. 2, line 3). The system of Burakoff may take as input the filings of securities issuers stored on one or more repositories, catalog the information (e.g., to identify all information relating to particular securities), determine the start and end points of individual filings, and determine the effective date for each (col. 6, lines 14-33). The system of Burakoff may produce output in the form of a computer-readable file containing items of information relating to a particular security (col. 9, lines 20-23).

2. Shklar

Shklar discloses a system for indexing content stored at various locations on the Internet (Abstract; col. 2, lines 16-18). In particular, the system of Shklar analyzes “documents” stored at

various locations, discerns each document's logical structure, and identifies the logical units into which each document may be divided (col. 2, lines 18-23; col. 4, lines 53-61). For example, a document containing three news items separated by asterisks may be divided into three logical units, one for each news item (FIG. 2; col. 4, lines 52-61). The system stores metadata identifying each logical unit, thereby allowing users to access an individual logical unit at its location within a document (col. 2, lines 23-29).

FIG. 1 of Shklar, which illustrates the manner in which the system responds to user requests to retrieve individual logical units, depicts terminal 110, which executes a browser (col. 4, lines 17-24). Using terminal 110, the user submits a request for content to server 130, which stores metadata representing individual logical units (col. 4, lines 40-41). Each logical unit is represented by a different metadata object that includes the information necessary to retrieve it (col. 4, lines 60-61; col. 5, lines 13-16). In response to the user's request, server 130 retrieves the metadata for the requested logical unit, and employs it to retrieve the logical unit on server 140 (col. 4, lines 25-32 and 41-42).

### C. Independent Claims 1, 18, and 35

As amended herein, each of claims 1, 18, and 35 includes limitations directed to a set of programmed instructions executed on a source file to identify a source location containing a particular data element within the source file. The programmed instructions employ at least one parameter relating to the data element's appearance within the source file to identify the source location. A representation of the data element is presented to a user in a file other than the source file in a manner which visually informs the user that the data element may be retrieved at the source location. A request is received from the user to retrieve the data element at the source location, and the indication of the source location is employed to retrieve the data element at the source location.

No combination of the cited references satisfies all of the limitations recited by any of claims 1, 18 or 35. For example, neither reference discloses executing a set of programmed instructions on a source file to identify a source location containing a particular data element within the source file, with the programmed instructions employing at least one parameter relating to the data element's

appearance within the source file to identify the source location. Additionally, neither reference discloses or suggests presenting to a user a representation of the data element in a file other than the source file in a manner which visually informs the user that the data element may be retrieved at the source location.

At a fundamental level, each cited reference discloses techniques for partitioning documents into logical segments and making the logical segments accessible to users. Thus, each reference discloses techniques for processing information *at the document level*. By contrast, each of claims 1, 18 and 35 includes limitations directed to *identifying a source location containing a particular data element* within a source file, and *employing an indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location*. Neither reference says anything at all about identifying a source location containing a particular data element, or employing an indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location, as each reference focuses on processing information at a higher level of abstraction – i.e., at the document level.

For example, Shklar, which the Office Action relies upon to satisfy claim limitations directed to receiving a request to retrieve a data element at a source location, discloses a technique for dividing a document (e.g., a news feed comprising multiple news stories) into logical units (e.g., individual news stories) and making those units accessible to users (Abstract). Shklar discloses a process for retrieving and presenting individual logical units upon on a user's request (see FIG. 1). Nowhere does Shklar say anything at all about identifying a source location containing a particular data element within a source file, receiving a request to retrieve the data element at the source location, or employing an indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location.

Burakoff fails to remedy this deficiency of Shklar, as Burakoff also says nothing at all about identifying a source location containing a particular data element within a source file, or employing an indication of the source location to retrieve the data element at the source location. Rather, as discussed above, Burakoff discloses a system for electronically compiling and reconciling securities filings so as to provide a complete, concise, user friendly and accessible set of information for investors (Abstract). Embodiments of the present invention are directed to solving a very different

problem than the system of Burakoff. Specifically, while Burakoff is directed to identifying and organizing items of compliance information, embodiments of the present invention are directed to enabling a user to retrieve a particular data element at a source location (e.g., within an item of compliance information).

In view of the foregoing, each of amended claims 1, 18 and 35 patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 18 and 35, and of the claims that depend respectively therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Burakoff in view of Shklar should be withdrawn.

D. Claims 52-54

As amended herein, each of independent claims 52, 53 and 54 includes limitations directed to receiving a request from a user to access at least one data element at a source location which comprises at least a portion of a source file containing the data element. The source location is identified via an execution of a set of programmed instructions which employs at least one parameter relating to the data element's appearance within the source file.

It should be apparent from the discussion above with reference to claims 1, 18 and 35 that neither of the cited references discloses or suggests receiving a request from a user to access at least one data element at a source location identified via an execution of a set of programmed instructions which employs at least one parameter relating to the data element's appearance within the source file. Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 52, 53 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Burakoff in view of Shklar should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. N0389.70009US01.

Dated: 9-29-08

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker

Randy J. Pritzker

Registration No.: 35,986

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

617.646.8000